

ATTACHMENT A

Remarks

By this Amendment, independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended for clarity and to better define the invention. Other dependent claims have also been amended consistent with the changes to independent claim 1, for clarity, and/or better conformance with US practice. Further and favorable action is solicited.

In the outstanding Office Action, restriction was required between method claims 1-9 (and now claim 11 containing an alternative recitation now canceled from dependent claim 3) and apparatus claim 10. In response to this requirement, method claims 1-9 and 11 are elected. However, in view of the amendments made to independent claims 1 and 10, this restriction requirement is traversed.

In the detailed description of the restriction requirement, the examiner noted that the method and apparatus did not share a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 in view of USP 4, 778,508 to Petitcollin et al.

However, both amended independent claims 1 and 10 now recite the same general inventive concept of the use of an air flow to support a glass sheet which occurs only after the termination of rotating rollers which previously supported the glass sheet as well as the support of the glass sheet by the rollers and the air flow at the same horizontal height level. In the Petitcollin patent, air flow occurs through the rollers so that the glass sheet is lifted therefrom long prior to reaching the bending section. This lifting by an air flow obviously also changes the horizontal height level of the glass sheet, so the horizontal height level does not remain the same.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the method claims and apparatus claim share a same general inventive concept which is not taught nor made obvious by the Petitcollin patent. Therefore, all of claims 1-11 should now be examined.